

REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. This amendment is believed to be fully responsive to all issues raised in the October 4, 2004 Office
5 Action.

Objections to the Specification

The typographical errors pointed out in the Office Action have been corrected per the Amendments to the Specification section above.

10

Rejections to the Claims

35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject
15 matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-11, 13, 16-18, 22, and 24-26 have been amended and claim 12 has been cancelled. Applicant believes pending claims 1-11 and 13-33 fulfill the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

20

35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant traverses this rejection. Claims 1-11 have been amended and claim 12 has been cancelled.

The Office states that, "Claims 1-12 are directed to method steps which can be practiced mentally in conjunction with pen and paper." Applicant respectfully disagrees with this analysis. As originally drafted, and as currently amended, claim 1 is directed to a method involving a computer process.

5 Specifically, claim 1, as amended, recites:

A method comprising:

receiving a request from a client device, the request comprising a hierarchical identifier;

10 comparing the hierarchical identifier with at least a portion of a configuration file to identify an appropriate user-mode process for handling the request; and

providing the request to the identified appropriate user-mode process

15

The receiving, comparing, and providing steps recited in claim 1 are not steps that could be practiced mentally in conjunction with pen and paper. Accordingly, claims 1-11 are directed to statutory subject matter as specified in 35 U.S.C. 101.

20

35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art (hereafter, "AAPA"), in view of Benitez et al (U.S. PG Pub 20020161908A1) (hereafter "Benitez").

5 The AAPA is a web server process that receives a request that includes a universal resource locator (URL). The web server process accesses a mapping function to identify an appropriate worker process based on the extension-identifying portion of the URL in the request. (*Application, page 11, line 24 – page 12, line 16.*) The AAPA does not describe a system in which a
 10 request comprising a hierarchical identifier is received and the hierarchical identifier is used to identify an appropriate user-mode process for handling the request.

Benitez is directed to a system that partitions an application program into page segments by observing the manner in which the application program is
 15 conventionally installed. A minimal portion of the application program is installed on a client system and the user launches the application in the same way that applications on other client file systems are started. An application program server streams the page segments to the client as the application program executes on the client and the client stores the page segments in a
 20 cache. Page segments are requested by the client from the application server whenever a page fault occurs from the cache for the application program. (*Benitez, Abstract.*) Benitez does not describe a system in which a hierarchical identifier associated with a request is used to determine an appropriate user-

mode process for handling the request. Furthermore, Benitez and AAPA are directed to different types of systems, and there is no suggestion in either to combine the two.

Claims 1-11 have been amended, and claim 12 has been cancelled,
5 rendering the rejection of claims 1-12 moot.

Claim 13, which is rejected for the same reasons given with reference to claim 1, as amended, recites:

10 A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing steps comprising:

causing a kernel-mode process in a server device to compare a hierarchical identifier associated with a client device generated request with at least a portion of a configuration file to identify a most applicable user-mode process for handling the
15 client device generated request within the server device; and

causing the kernel-mode process to provide the client device generated request to the identified most applicable user-mode process.

20 The Office contends that "AAPA teaches the invention substantially as claimed including causing a user-mode process in a server device to compare information associated with a request to a file to identify a most applicable user-mode process for handling the request within the server device," but the Office also states that, "AAPA does not specifically teach...comparing a hierarchical
25 identifier associated with the request with a configuration file." Applicant would like to point out that the use of a *hierarchical identifier* to determine an

appropriate user-mode process for handling a request represents a significant difference between the claimed invention and the AAPA.

The Office further contends that Benitez discloses "requests made to an application streaming file system comprising the comparison of hierarchical identifier to a configuration file in a kernel-mode environment." (*Office Action*,
5 *page 5.*) Applicant respectfully disagrees. Benitez, paragraph [0193] describes using kernel-mode streaming file system driver and a user-mode client. Benitez, paragraph [0161] describes mapping certain filenames to indicate that those files, which may typically be installed on the client device, are actually
10 available from the server. Nowhere does Benitez describe a system in which a hierarchical identifier associated with a request is used to determine an appropriate user-mode process to handle the request. Accordingly, claim 13 is allowable over AAPA in view of Benitez.

Claims 14-24 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable
15 claim 13.


Claims 25-33 are rejected on the same grounds given for rejecting claims 1-12 and claims 13-24. Accordingly, claims 25-33 are allowable for the same reasons stated above with reference to claim 13.

Conclusion

Claims 1-11 and 13-33 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the present application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance
5 of the application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned agent to discuss the unresolved issue.

10

Respectfully Submitted,
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
421 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201

15 Dated: 1/3/05

Name: Kayla D. Brant
Reg. No. 46,576
Phone No. (509) 324-9256 ext. 242